

CHRISTIANITY and *CRISIS*

A BI-WEEKLY JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN OPINION

Volume 1, No. 21

December 1, 1941

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Momentous Decision By Narrow Margin

THE immediate significance of the vote taken in the House on November 13 is readily enough discerned. It was, of course, in no sense equivalent to a declaration of war. Like similar, though less weighty, decisions taken in the past which have moved us closer to a possible total involvement, this act of Congress could quite consistently be supported by members of that body who were eager to limit hostilities to the sea lanes. At the same time the entire setting of the drama made it impossible to reconcile any affirmative vote with a desire to maintain peace for the United States at the expense of a Nazi triumph. In this sense, then, the die is cast.

But behind this evident meaning of neutrality revision there is something ominous. The smallness of the majority gives occasion for sober reflection. Whatever reasons be assigned, the inferences to be drawn are disquieting. We may well reflect on those 194 votes.

It will be said, as it has been said all along, that the constituents of these congressmen, to whom they listen are not awake to the actual peril. But at most this means not a lack of knowledge of the facts (for the press is full of the facts), but different interpretations of the facts. And that means a lack of a common frame of reference for interpreting the world situation. Without such a frame of reference, acceptable to an overwhelming majority of the people, there can be no authentic national policy in this crisis. To move toward war by bare majority vote may satisfy the technical requirements of democracy but it is an insensitive conscience that would not be burdened by the fact that a fateful decision has been taken without broader sanction. This is not to question either the wisdom or the great importance of what Congress has done. The point is that America is still far from assuming a conscious and confident role of any kind in this world struggle. Had the slight majority been the other way, this conviction would be equally valid. The contention that the vote did not represent the conviction of the people—and both sides so contend—is not very convincing. Had the nation as a whole been ready for decisive

action in any direction Congress would have shown no such dissension.

In terms of Christian ethics the inference from such a narrow vote is not heartening. If the final affirmative vote is grievous to the Christian pacifist because it brings us nearer to war, to the non-pacifist Christian the slender majority affords little more satisfaction. It means that wanton destruction of life and property and brutal degradation of human beings create no burning sense of direct and immediate responsibility among the American people as a whole—so long as it is three thousand miles away.

To be sure, no one but a romanticist assumes that a sense of moral responsibility alone ever carries a nation into war. But this country entered the war in 1917 by a vote of more than seven to one. And it is difficult to understand how the menace to our cherished ideal of freedom of the seas for our ships could have been thought greater then than now. Be that as it may, the response of our people to the appeal to check aggression in Europe was vastly greater at that time even though the case was much less convincing.

Mr. Lippmann, whose understanding of imponderables is usually impressive, has noted the fact that the declaration of war in 1917, enacted by an immense majority, came "only after the German attack became violent," and followed years of debate. Yes, violent against *our* ships. Does no amount of violence not only to the ships but to the lives and liberties of one defenseless nation after another overcome our sense of physical remoteness and relative security? If it must be so the fact is depressing, but also it raises again the question how great a consensus, moral or otherwise, there must be to justify so terrible an adventure as war.

Another ground for deep concern is the fact of a defection—no one knows how large—from the administration program on the eve of the vote because of dissatisfaction with its labor policy. Does this mean that members of Congress were ready to vote for neutrality revision without being really convinced that it was necessary, and were therefore easily

turned aside? That is a grievous thought. Or does it mean that there are men in Congress who would rather see Hitler triumph than to see the United Mine Workers get a bit more power? That is even more grievous.

The vote, many of us believe, narrow as the margin was, will be overwhelmingly ratified by history. But the business we are in is too momentous

for any but clear-cut decisions that have a nation behind them. Something seems to be lacking in our democratic processes. It is not just a question of speed; we can sacrifice speed, and we do, in order to make valid democratic decisions. But what makes a valid decision when the lives of our youth and the liberties of our descendants are balanced against each other?

God and the Decisions of History

JOHN A. MACKAY

HOW far is God related to historical events? To what extent may human decisions express His will? Can He ever be regarded as approving the decision of an individual or a nation to employ force, particularly military force, to achieve a moral purpose?

I

With respect to some of the things involved in this general question, Christians are in substantial agreement. They are agreed that what ultimately matters in life is to know the will of God and do it. They are agreed that God as the Creator and Lord of Life has a right to command His creatures. They are agreed that God's commands are never arbitrary fiats, but are always consonant with His divine nature, which is the source and norm of all human righteousness. What God wills is always an expression of what He is. To obey God, therefore, is, in the last analysis, to copy God, to be like Him, to do something which He Himself does. When the question is asked, How can God be known? the Christian answer is this. The absolute standard for our knowledge of who God is and what He does is Jesus Christ. This standard is not merely the Jesus who lived and taught and died in Palestine, but the Risen Christ who is the supreme lord of human destiny. Jesus Christ who was and is, is the beginning, the centre, and the goal of history, in and through whom God will give history its crowning meaning and bring it to a consummation worthy of Himself.

Little doubt exists also in the minds of Christians who take Biblical religion seriously, that the God and Father of Jesus Christ controls history and all its happenings. Historical appearances to the contrary, Christians believe that God "is the Ruler yet," that He cannot be baffled, that His will and no other will ultimately prevail. If the lordship of God means anything at all, it means that everything lies in His

hands as soft clay: the physical universe, with its stars and electronic forces; world history, with its human tensions, its demonic powers, and its cultural cycles. Neither do Christians find it difficult to believe that God, in the execution of His gracious purpose for mankind, can overrule sinful and tragic happenings for His glory and the greater good of men. Nor do they balk at the Biblical affirmation that God uses human personalities and groups to execute His behests, even though they, as His instruments, should not personally know Him or consciously serve Him. Some important consequences derive from these premises of faith. The first great decision of history, which theologians call the Fall of man, will prove in the end to have been, as St. Augustine called it, "that blessed Fall." All things will continue "to work together for good to them that love God." Pagan world rulers will again be "girded" like Cyrus to do God's bidding, even though remaining unconscious of their true significance in history, as the Scourges, the Gaolers, or the Liberators of the Almighty.

The matter becomes more difficult, however, when the question is raised: How far may there be coincidence between the will of God and the decisions which men consciously make in His name and in response to what they believe to be His prompting? While it is true that many of the decisions which we make as Christians are made in loyalty to certain great principles of right conduct as these are found in Holy Scripture and especially in the teaching of Jesus, others are not founded upon general principles at all, but rather upon an inward sense of guidance. This sense of guidance does not exclude reference to objective standards of conduct. It may take full account of all the circumstances and proprieties involved in a situation. It may come after much self-examination in the light of God and His Word, and after agonizing prayer to God for His

unmistakable direction. But when it does come, it comes with an inwardness and conviction that God wants us to do this rather than something else, which, from the point of view of a general principle, might be equally valid. To affirm the truth of personal divine guidance is not to be unaware that many have claimed it who were led into strange aberrations. Yet the reality of such guidance is one of the most precious facts of the Bible and of experience. It is possible to say, therefore, with assurance that decisions may be made in personal life in which the will of God and the will of man coincide.

It may equally be affirmed that human decisions that gave birth to projects for human welfare and the advancement of God's Kingdom were taken in response to the will of God. History is studded with instances in which the initiation of missionary endeavor, the origins and progress of a religious awakening, schemes for cultural development and social betterment, were consciously conceived and carried through in obedience to the will of God. That is to say, both in the Church and in the secular order God wills righteousness, in such a way that those who execute His will may feel themselves to be, and are right in so feeling themselves to be, directed by Him.

II

The really difficult problem emerges in cases in which actions undertaken in the name of God may involve the employment of physical force against other people. The extreme case of this kind is war. Thus the most crucial issue that can be raised concerning the will of God is whether He ever calls men to employ force in any human situation when the use of such force might involve the destruction of those against whom it is used. The real question is not whether God ever wills a war which, because He willed it, would be a "holy" war. It is rather whether a holy God, in a world like ours, ever wills political action, involving armed might, which, while necessary, could in no sense be termed "holy." I am still ready to accept the formula which some of us tried to work out at Oxford in 1937, that "war is a particular demonstration of the power of sin in this world and a defiance of the righteousness of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and Him Crucified." I believe equally, none the less, that in a sinful world God may and does will force even in the form of war to avoid the prevalence of organized unrighteousness, and in the interests of relative human justice. I wish to make my position on this matter perfectly clear, both as regards the thesis which I am propounding and its implications for the human situation today.

Here is the crucial issue: How far may a decision

to make war express the will of God? To what extent, for example, can it be said that Oliver Cromwell, George Washington, and Abraham Lincoln were the executors of the will of God in history? Or, putting the matter concretely in terms of today, Is it possible in the light of the Christian revelation to affirm the unashamed and uncompromising conviction that God wills that Adolf Hitler and all that he stands for should be opposed and, if possible, defeated by military means?

There are a number of considerations which have a direct and important bearing upon this question:

First, God Himself as the Lord of Life and the moral governor of the universe makes use of force.

The natural physical sanctions which follow the violation of moral law, what are they but the inexorable and drastic nexus which God has established between sin and punishment? Is there anything more terrifying that can scourge society than venereal disease, which dooms not only the guilty but, perchance, also, generations of innocent people? Yet who will deny that this divine sanction must ultimately be regarded as a merciful dispensation to teach mankind, in the course of the ages, the sanctity of the moral order?

The soul of man is also so constituted that psychic forces of an inexorable character come into operation when man deliberately rejects goodness and chooses evil. In such a case character may degenerate until an incarnation of human perversity is produced, such as is symbolized in the New Testament by those who have sinned against the Holy Ghost, whose moral state is hopeless. The conscious rejection of light leads to the deification of darkness. What shall we say, moreover, of those Biblical descriptions of divine judgment during the course of history or at its consummation. These pictures appear in the Synoptic Gospels, in the Epistles of Paul, and in the Johannine writings. When men ultimately reject love they are dealt with as dehumanized types whose further action must be thwarted and whose right to continued existence is challenged. The incarnate symbol of divine judgment is none other than Jesus Himself, the Jesus with the flaming eye, and the uplifted lash, and the hand that overturned the money changers' tables. It is time to realize that the picture of the "Christ of the whip," as we might call Him, is as native to the Gospel records as the parable of the Prodigal Son. In other words, while the love of God is measureless to seek the lost and to forgive the penitent, the justice of God is uncompromising where the attempt is made in the name of righteousness to set up a human order which wrongs men and violates all the principles of the righteousness of God. When iniquity is exalted into a principle and given a religious basis, God strikes.

Sometimes God strikes indirectly through the very

products of human sin. There is a sense in which the horrors of the present international situation represent the "voice of outraged history" against certain things, shameless and hypocritical things, which were done in the name of righteousness by the democratic nations after the last war. From that particular point of view the Nazi Party and their leader may be regarded as a monstrous, but inexorable, product of human sin. As such they become "a sharp threshing instrument having teeth" in the hands of the Almighty to convert the whole of Europe into a vast threshing floor beneath the Nazi flail. And yet there is no reason why these human monstrosities, whose paternity must be acknowledged by the statesmen of the last and present generation, and who are God's scourge, should not be dealt with as any plague is dealt with which blights the life of mankind and defies God's moral order.

III

Not only, however, does God Himself employ force in certain situations through the operation of outraged law in the personal and social life of men; He also delegates the right to use force. This fact of God's economy in history might be formulated thus: In a sinful world God delegates the use of force to the state as His "minister," for the prevention of anarchy in secular society, and for the achievement of relative justice. The state, as a principle or order in secular society, is as much a part of the divine economy as is the church. Nothing is more important than to recognize the common origin of these two orders and, at the same time, their total diversity of function. The Church of Jesus Christ must never use force. The state, on the other hand, is differently situated. While the success of all true government must be based upon factors of a moral rather than a physical nature, there present themselves to every state, both in its internal and external life, situations rising from human sin which can be dealt with exclusively on the physical plane, by the application of force. The state, of course, must exercise the greatest restraint in the use of force. It must not, at its peril, become imperialistic, or arrogate to itself the right to force its will upon other human groups which have their own inherent rights to self-government. The state must even be ready to forego the pursuit of selfish national interests when wider human interests are concerned. It must even be willing, for the good of mankind in general, to put into abeyance the traditional principle of national sovereignty and submit its interests to a wider tribunal of nations. No state dare arrogate to itself the right to establish world or continental order in terms of its own selfish interests, ignoring the good of mankind and the inalterable divine principles of

human relationship. When any state essays to do this it is the duty of states which have a contrary view of human relations to counter by force the designs of that other power, and, if possible, to break its military might. In terms of the present human situation, it is not only right for nations to take issue by force with the Nazi program for mankind; it is their responsibility before God to do so. While they do well to recognize that human sin, even their own sin, has led to the creation of this human monstrosity, they owe it to the uncounted millions who are the victims of this monstrosity to rescue them by all means in their power from the satanic consequences of the new order.

The United States of America cannot evade this responsibility under God, nor can it discharge it without deciding to gamble its very existence in the armed effort to break the yoke of Nazidom. In a world which has become one for weal or for woe, this nation is confronted with a titanic police problem. Having said this, it is necessary to clarify the implications of the thesis here propounded.

Let me repeat: there can never be any question of a "holy war." The fact that a given war may be justified as an unpleasant police operation to stave off anarchy and maintain enlightened human justice does not make it "holy." The fact that this war may be undertaken in the name of God and, as Karl Barth puts it, "for the sake of Christ and Christian truth," does not make it a holy war. For the attribute "holy" cannot be applied to anything that is not directly related to the Kingdom of God, and war has nothing to do with the Kingdom of God as such. The most that any war can do is to restrain demonic forces which run counter to everything that the Kingdom of God means, and thereafter, by the establishment of a just peace and a world order in which the great liberties are guaranteed, make way for the revelation of that Kingdom which is righteousness and peace. It is when war ends and the secular power lays down its sword that the real human problem begins. This fact makes it important that Christians, even while war is being waged, and while they may not only justify it, but take part in furthering its progress, should be agonizingly concerned about the foundations of a true peace, whose principles would be consonant with the principles of God's Kingdom.

IV

As for the Christian Church, it does not make war. It does not as a Church subordinate its spiritual task to the task of fighting or winning a war. The Church does its part when it sheds the white light of God upon all human situations, when it makes clear to the state and to its own members what is involved in certain human trends. When the Church becomes

clear that the ideologies and pretensions of certain human groups seek to substitute the authority of God by their own authority, with the consequent threat to the foundations of all moral order, the Church should unashamedly and uncompromisingly proclaim that fact. Nor should its own members be left in any doubt as to where the Church stands with respect to the authority of the state when, in the judgment of the Church, the state stands for principles of righteousness.

The Christian Church, however, while it may give its full sanction to the declaration and the promotion of war, will devote itself, in consonance with its own true nature and in loyalty to its divine Head, to the redemption of men. It will seek to save men, not primarily that they may be better soldiers or better

citizens, but that they may be better children of God. Across the frontiers of human division it will continue to unite those for whom the supreme loyalty is loyalty to Christ, and who are never unaware of the limitations and hypocrisy of man's highest efforts to establish human righteousness in the world.

For the painful truth is that man's best endeavours, even when he is justified in believing that God wills the actions which he undertakes, are always carried on with personally mixed motives and in a faltering and sinful human way. But that is no reason why, though conscious of his own guilt, he should not go forward in his faltering human way to make the world a worthier place for sons of God to live in, and closer in its principles to the principles of God's everlasting Kingdom.

Religion's Contribution to Harmonious Labor Relations*

EDWIN E. WITTE

A BASIC difficulty in labor relations is that all of us constantly talk and think of "labor" and "capital" abstractly, forgetting that both these terms stand for millions of human beings. Labor and capital are factors in production, but also major elements in the purpose of all economic activity. As Monseignor John A. Ryan has put it: "Industry exists for man, not man for industry; and industry exists for every man who is in any way connected with it or in any way dependent upon it." A different but equally significant aspect of the true character of what is often called "the labor problem" has been emphasized by Professor Sumner H. Slichter, the President of the American Economics Association: "Industry produces men as well as goods."

"Labor," in the sense of the services which labor renders, is a commodity bought and sold in much the same way as are other commodities. But labor is a very different commodity from any other. The basic difference is that the commodity labor is inseparable from the human being, the laborer.

It is more difficult to grasp what might be called "the human side of capital." There is one meaning of the term which relates to the physical instruments of production, inanimate things, without feelings and without a soul. When referred to in connection with labor relations, however, "capital" again relates

to human beings, with all the attributes which distinguish man from the rest of creation.

"Capital" in this sense consists of the people who have invested their savings in enterprise, and, still more significantly, it refers to the executives who run our businesses. From many points of view, management is today a factor in production, distinct from both labor and capital. The executives of our great corporations derive most of their income from salaries, not dividends. Management has become a specialized function and more and more is coming to be looked upon as a position of public trust. Corporations may be soulless, but the managers who run business are human beings much like all the rest of us.

Once the problem is approached from this point of view, what needs to be done to bring about more harmonious relations between labor and capital is clear. The essential measures to this end have been stated repeatedly by the churches, and in much the same terms regardless of creeds.

Within a year following the close of the first World War, organizations representing all of the three major faiths in the United States promulgated programs for social reconstruction, which included statements of the position of the churches on the relations between labor and capital. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America declared at a special meeting at Cleveland in May, 1919:

"I. That the teachings of Jesus are those of essen-

*Remarks as a Discussion Leader on the question, "How Can Organized Religion Contribute to Harmonious Relations Between Labor and Capital," at the Conference on Religion and the World Today, held at Harvard University, July-August, 1941.

tial democracy and express themselves through brotherhood and the cooperation of all groups. We deplore class struggle and declare against all class domination, whether of capital or labor. Sympathizing with labor's desire for a better day and a more equitable share in the profits and management of industry, we stand for orderly and progressive social reconstruction instead of revolution by violence.

"2. That an ordered and constructive democracy in industry is as necessary as political democracy, and that collective bargaining and the sharing of shop control and management are inevitable steps in its attainment.

"3. That the first charge upon industry should be that of a wage sufficient to support an American standard of living."

The Administrative Committee of the National Catholic War Council promulgated a Program of Social Reform, which included, among other items, the following statements:

"The laborer is a human being, not merely an instrument of production.

"The laborer's right to a decent livelihood is a first moral charge upon industry . . .

"The right of labor to organize and to deal with employers through representatives has been asserted above in connection with the discussion of the War Labor Board. It is hoped that this right will never again be called in question."

The Central Conference of American Rabbis adopted a Social Justice Program, which included this paragraph:

"The Conference recognizes the right of Labor to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing as an instrument by which to secure its rights at the hands of employers. It further recognizes the right of labor to share more equitably in determining the conditions of labor as well as the reward."

These declarations, although made more than twenty years ago, may well serve as statements of the essentials for harmonious relations between labor and capital today. They are based on the premise that labor has an interest in industry as well as capital. They recognize the rights of private property, but stress that power and wealth carry with them the obligations of stewardship, which must be exercised not for personal gain but for social welfare.

All churches have asserted that it is an obligation of industry to pay wages "sufficient to maintain the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort." In-

dustry owes labor the obligation of a safe and healthful place of employment and conditions of work as good as they can reasonably be made. In this day and age, also, there can no longer be any controversy over such matters as reasonable hours of labor, restriction of child labor, compensation for industrial accidents and diseases, unemployment compensation, and old age insurance; and, personally, I feel that health insurance belongs in the same category. Equally important, if not more so, is the matter of decent treatment in the shop and observation of the fundamental principles of justice in every action taken by management in relation to individual workmen.

As organized religion of every creed has recognized, beyond all these measures and policies there is need for according labor a voice in the determination of conditions of employment. Adequate representation of labor is under modern conditions possible only through trade unions which are free from the domination both of the state and of employers. In an age of organization, labor cannot justly be denied the right of combination accorded to all other groups in society. Labor, moreover, must be free to exert its economic power through refusal to work when conditions become intolerable. Such policies are in the interest, not only of labor, but of all people. As Professor Slichter has said: "The kind of men a democratic community needs may not be produced in shops which are small oriental despotisms." The clearest proof of the close connection between industrial and political democracy is the fact that in all totalitarian countries the first act of the dictators was to suppress the trade unions and to outlaw strikes.

While strongly supporting labor in its demand for a voice in the determination of conditions of employment, organized religion has also recognized the rights of employers and of society. It has opposed resort to violence and aligned itself against sudden, revolutionary changes. It recognizes that management must be left in a position where it will be able to discharge its function of directing enterprise and that capital must have a return which fairly compensates it for risks taken.

Organized religion recognizes that the state has important functions to perform in connection with labor relations. It must establish minimum standards governing working conditions to which backward and unsocial employers must conform. It must prevent industrial warfare from becoming actual civil war. Under all circumstances it must protect life and property and preserve law and order. It can make a real contribution to more harmonious relations by establishing impartial agencies for the adjustment of labor disputes.

Beyond this the state should not go in labor rela-

tions. In agreement with both American labor and capital, religious thought recognizes as a monstrosity the fascist state in which all individual interests are merged. Instead, the state is but one of many social institutions, which like all others exists for the human advancement, not as an end in itself. The rights of the public, like all rights, are not one-sided. There are public rights in labor disputes and obligations of labor to the public and the community, but also rights of labor which cannot be ignored without producing serious consequences, by either industry or the state.

Instead of dictation by the state, organized religion stands for self-government in industry, with due safeguards to protect the rights of the public. Like political democracy, industrial democracy does not always operate smoothly and, from a short-time point of view, is very apt not to be as efficient as is autocracy. It is an American belief, however, that, in the long run, people are most likely to be satisfied and to produce the most goods and services when they have a direct voice in the control of their own lives. Most important of all is the consideration that only in this way can we develop the sort of free men we need in a democracy.

Summing up all that has been said, I can do no better than to quote Dr. William M. Leiserson, now

a member of the National Labor Relations Board, in his thought-provoking little book, *Right and Wrong in Labor Relations*:

"Instead of a more or less mechanical problem caused by a conflict of economic forces, we now see a host of psychological and social problems brought on by the necessity that human beings, in the form of regimented armies of managers, officials, salaried employes, and wage-earners must live together, with intricate obligations to each other as order-givers and order-takers. Employer and Employee are no longer the economist's abstractions, Capital and Labor, but personalities bound together in contractual arrangements not unlike the relationship set up by the marriage contract. The search for a solution of a theoretical Labor Problem therefore appears as futile as a search for a solution of an abstract marriage or family problem. Instead, we seek methods of securing mutual accommodations and adjustment in the innumerable differences that are bound to arise from the human relationship of managers and workers."

This is the approach to harmonious relations between labor and capital which organized religion has taken, and this seems to me, a life-long student of labor problems, to be the only sound approach.

The World Church: News and Notes

Letter from Geneva

An inspiring letter has come from Geneva to the members of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches. The letter is signed by Marc Boegner, Alphonse Koechlin, Charles Guillon, W. A. Visser 't Hooft, Hans Schonfeld, and Nils Ehrenstrom—names which represent the churches of Scandinavia, France and the occupied territories. It deals with the state of the ecumenical Church in Europe and reads in part: "We have noted with deep gratitude that the cause for which our movement stands is today more truly alive in the hearts and minds of church members all over the world than it has been in less troubled times. Is it not an astonishing fact that after two years of war on such a vast scale we may not only continue our work but even develop it in many directions? Thus with regard to our own part of the world we may report that contacts are being maintained with most of the churches, that in the course of September and October our secretaries are visiting church leaders in six countries, that (during that same period) two important ecumenical study-conferences are being held, that the spiritual aid to prisoners of war is extended to new categories, that the work of our Press Service touches wider circles than ever, that the spiritual and material help to refugees is maintained and that our Geneva office has become the center of large-scale Bible

distribution (on behalf of the American Bible Society) to the European countries. But more important still we may state that the ecumenical movement proves today a God-given instrument to help all churches in sharing in the great spiritual blessings which have come to the suffering and persecuted churches. Our friend and colleague Bishop Berggrav wrote recently; 'The grace of God grows in the soil of the Militant Church.' Our task is today to spread that message."

Karl Barth on Participating in Evil

Karl Barth has recently published a little pamphlet entitled: "Our Swiss Church in the Contemporary Scene." In it he declares: "We can and must know that the peril which threatens us (Switzerland) is an intolerable one. There are evils which one is able to bear because, though they may be difficult to bear, they do not involve the conscience or the inner dignity of the victim. There are other evils which one cannot bear because one must not bear them, because under them life becomes shameful and because acceptance of such evils involves one in common guilt with the sin of others. It must be noted that the Christian willingness to suffer finds its natural limit at this point. The admonition, not to resist evil, certainly does not mean that we ought to participate in evil. It is in that sense that the tyranny which

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th Street, New York, N. Y.

\$1.50 per year

10 cents per copy

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR	RHODA E. McCULLOCH
<i>Chairman</i>	FRANCIS P. MILLER
JOHN C. BENNETT	EDWARD L. PARSONS
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
JOHN A. MACKAY	

threatens us today is in the profoundest sense unbearable.

"It is unbearable when a tyrannical state refuses to be satisfied with external obedience (which it might justly demand as the authority responsible for order) but, making divine pretensions, actually demands the submission of conscience and destroys the freedom of every word and every thought, denying the legitimacy of every right and responsibility but that of its own will and its own power.

"It is in the profoundest sense intolerable that the Church should submit to a cultus which gives a state divine authority and which confines the real testimony of the Church to pathetic whispers in the limited realm of private piety. One may bear such things in an emergency as one accepts epidemics and earthquakes. But one certainly cannot accept them as a matter of will. If one has any freedom to say so one must say 'No' to them and say it with all one's heart and soul. I mention only one instance of what in this tyrannical system one cannot bear in the sense of participating in it. One cannot directly or indirectly participate in either the gross or the more subtle oppression of the Jews. It is intolerable to do so because it is unjust and shameful."

German Bishop Conforms

Bishop Marahans of the Lutheran Church of Hanover whose vacillations have become notorious, for he has at times cooperated with the Confessional Church and at other times has supported the Nazi government, has come out with a broadside against Russia. In a telegram to Hitler he congratulates him on summoning all Europe in the crusade against Bolshevism, "the deadly enemy of all order and western Christian civilization." Bishop Marahans continues: "The fact that British policy is now openly using Bolshevism as an auxiliary against the Reich makes it finally clear that it is not concerned with Christianity but only with the destruction of the German nation."

Public Library
Woodward & Kirby Aves.
Detroit, Mich.

650 12-41

Pope's Attitude to the War

The *London Times* on October 21 published the following interesting note from its Lisbon correspondent: "His Holiness in private episcopal audiences has drawn an important distinction between the Nazi and Communist systems. His public discourses have implied the obvious truth that the philosophy behind each is fundamentally anti-Christian, but in private he has repeatedly said that, whereas Nazism is almost entirely evil in its inspiration, Communism has in it certain elements of natural good which, even if utterly perverted, still exist. Bolshevism is in some sense a corruption of the virtues of brotherly love and self-sacrifice, whereas Nazism is a direct and untrammelled manifestation of hatred and greed."

The Bible in Germany

Under the title, a "Traveller in Germany," published in the last number of the Swiss Roman Catholic *Kirchenzeitung*, were recorded some interesting personal impressions of Germany including the following:

"The public is buying more Bibles and religious books than before. Sermons are much better than they used to be. The clergy is conscious of the call of the hour; there are only too many questions to be dealt with, and the people are more receptive to the Word of God. The Church is the only place where the German of today can still hear a comparatively free, true, courageous word. . . . I was astonished and rejoiced to see that these preachers are not over-cautious. Their preaching is right up to date, and deals exclusively with the fundamental truths of Christianity; and they courageously defend the rights of personality and the uniqueness of the Christian faith over against the exaggerated nationalistic theories."

Conscientious Objectors in Great Britain

Of a total of 6,700,000 registrations for the army in Great Britain, 61,000 registered as conscientious objectors. Of these 41,000 had appeared before the tribunals on July 5, 1941. Of this total of 41,000, 6% or 2,389 had been granted unconditional exemption. 15,300 or 37% of the total were given conditional exemption, which means that they were assigned to work of national importance, chiefly agriculture or skilled industrial work. 12,168 or 29% were assigned to non-combatant military service; and 11,446 or 28% of the total were rejected as C O's and assigned to military service.

Dr. John A. Mackay, author of the long article in this issue, is President of Princeton Theological Seminary and a member of the CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS Editorial Board.

Dr. Edwin E. Witte, author of the short article in this issue, is professor of Economics at the University of Wisconsin.

We wish to remind you that we accept both new subscriptions and renewals to THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, the English weekly edited by Dr. J. H. Oldham.